

**Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
Lewis County Courthouse
351 NW North St.
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**December 17, 2009
Meeting Notes**

Members Present: Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Ron Averill, Lewis County; Patrick Sorensen, City of Centralia; Mark White, Chehalis Tribe; Merlin MacReynold, City of Chehalis; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County

Members Absent: Town of Bucoda

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from November 19 Work Session and Business Meeting
- Ripe and Ready Studies Report
- Proposed ESA Adolphson Contract Amendment
- Memo from City of Chehalis
- Coordinated Study
- Upstream Storage Analysis Phase 2B
- Expenditure Review
- Memo re: Election of Officers

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:36 P.M.

2. Introductions

The Board members and audience introduced themselves.

3. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved without objection.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes from November 19, 2009

Chairman Averill stated without objection the meeting notes from both the general meeting and work session would be approved. There was no objection and the notes were approved.

5. Public Comment

Ms. Julie Powe, Chehalis, stated she has been following the Flood Authority since its inception and is pleased with the unity with the Flood Authority, the Corps, the State and Legislature. She encouraged the Board to maintain Chairman Averill and Vice Chair Willis in those positions. She addressed the resolution for Phase 2B. As a member of the committee to write the PMP she initially was pleased with the resolution; however the Corps has not come forward with the material needed to get the PMP completed in a timely manner. The next meeting is not until February and the Plan is not even a quarter complete. Ms. Powe believes the committee needs to move forward with the studies so if there is a chance of merging with the levee plan it can be done without sacrificing the money.

Chairman Averill stated this is a topic to be discussed later in the agenda today.

Mr. Dave Finn, Curtis, stated he would not be personally affected if dams were not built but he knows a number of people who would be affected. He believes people need to find out if the dams will do what it is hoped they will do and help everyone down river to Aberdeen. He encouraged the Flood Authority not to slow down; he understands that the wheels of government turn slowly but he also knows that the Flood Authority can have an effect on how fast those wheels turn. He asked not to slow down on the Phase 2B and keep the pressure on the Corps to work to find a total solution that will help everyone in the Basin.

6. Reports

a. Chairman's Report

Chairman Averill summarized the work session held this morning. The Flood Authority contracted with Earth Economics to do a study of the Chehalis water shed in terms of the environmental and economic aspects. Mr. David Batker briefed the members of the initial phase of the work, which is to place an economic value on what that environment provides to the population. All the data has not been collected and the documents on which they can scientifically base data are quite divergent. The initial evaluation is that we get between \$1 and \$11 billion of value of what the environment provides the citizens in the Chehalis Basin, the watershed and the State of Washington. As the work continues, the numbers will be firmed up and the types of projects will be looked at by the Flood Authority in what we can do in terms of flood mitigation and economic issues.

Another issue discussed was the formation of a flood control district under RCW 86.09 and 85.38. The question was whether that was the best route to take and if there are other alternatives. A firm that consults with flood zone districts gave some preliminary information as to what flood control zones can or cannot do. There are a number of options and before a decision is made about a flood control district or flood zone district there will be additional studies and discussion of procedures, the governing body, the boundaries, and many more questions. It is generally agreed among most Flood Authority members that some sort of governing body is needed to solely look at flood control. This may require more meetings between the jurisdictions and the Tribe.

Chairman Averill stated the supplemental budget made it into the Governor's budget which is very good news. Mr. Mackey will explain more about this.

At the last meeting, Commissioner Willis asked for additional information on the EES billing and received a response on that. Commissioner Willis asked for an itemized breakdown of expenses and what the Flood Authority is paying for and she has received that information from Mr. Muller. Chairman Averill stated the information is available for anyone who would like to have it.

b. Member Reports

Mr. Schillinger asked who the sponsor is of the Twin Cities Project. Chairman Averill stated the State is the non-federal sponsor and the Office of Financial Management specifically.

c. Correspondence

The Chair and Vice Chair are working with Ms. Takash with the Corps on correspondence to go out to individuals who left comments at the open houses. A matrix has been drafted with all the questions and

people are being directed to specific groups if they need further explanation. There will be additional open houses where those issues can be brought up.

d. Facilitator's Report

Mr. Bruce Mackey introduced Ms. Marjorie Wolfe, ESA Adolfson Regional Director for Water Resources who heads the Portland office. Her capacity will be similar to Dave Carlton, who is still on the project and providing technical advice. Ms. Wolfe has a water resource engineering degree and 20+ years experience and will be a tremendous asset for the Flood Authority.

The sub-committee asked for a report from Ecology on Phase 2A to ask about fatal flaws. A letter was received from Ecology with a generally good review and statement that they saw no fatal flaws on what has been done to date.

Chairman Averill asked Spencer Easton to be sure everyone received a copy of that letter.

Mr. Mark White stated there was a concern about sedimentation and Mr. White believes this should be addressed early on.

Mr. Mackey stated the regulatory work group has met three times and are in the final stages of reviewing their report. That report will most likely be on the January agenda.

Mr. Mackey thanked the governor's office for the supplemental budget. This budget will allow the Flood Authority to continue with the consulting services and it includes \$720,000 for potential projects or extension of work, as well as \$1 million to study the formation of a flood control district.

Mr. Thompson asked where in the process is the flood mitigation plan.

Mr. Mackey stated the first draft has been issued and ESA is working with the Board Advisory Committee to set up a process for review and the draft for final consideration will be available in March.

Mr. Thompson asked if it will then go to Emergency Management or FEMA.

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority will decide how it will be adopted after public hearings.

e. State Team Report

Mr. John Donahue reported on the Twin Cities project. The letter that went out regarding the questions from the open houses included a table with the questions and answers. That will be posted on the website: Chehalisbasin.org.

There is emerging information from the Twin Cities project which includes an update in the project schedule and a report on the hydraulic modeling effort. Mr. Donahue proposes a meeting with a mix of the Flood Authority and Flood Authority staff and state agency staff to discuss those issues. Other questions could be brought to that meeting. The last Thursday in January is a date that might work. He asked that the Flood Authority consider staff that would be helpful in those two issues.

Mr. Donahue stated he would send out confirmation of the meeting on January 28, most likely to be held in the morning and the location to be determined.

Mr. Schillinger asked if the Skookumchuck Dam has issues with the modification, or if it is part of the Twin Cities project.

Mr. Donahue stated it is part of the project. Mr. Goss' staff is working on questions and working with Trans Alta regarding specific proposal and vetting those proposals. There is a proposal in the general evaluation report, which is still in the development and analysis stage and will not be available in January.

Mr. Schillinger stated he agrees with Mr. Finn's earlier statement. The Flood Authority has been working on flooding for a long time. Everyone would benefit by something being done and if there is anything close or makes sense, it is at the Skookumchuck Dam. He doesn't believe additional permits are required and it will not cost a lot of money and will provide broad benefits.

Mr. Goss stated the Corps is looking at the national economic development plan which proposes 11,000 additional acre feet and the locally preferred plan which would be 9,000 acre feet in addition for storage. The Corps needs to get rough designs and costs for that and perhaps additional information, such as permits, time frames, etc. That information is a couple of months out.

f. Corps of Engineers Report

Mr. Goss stated the Corps is working on submitting a complete preliminary draft of the PMP to the working group on January 29. A tentative schedule includes:

- January 29: Submit the plan
- February 7: Receive written comment from reviewers
- February 12: Agenda
- February 20-21: Meeting to go through comments

Another meeting will be needed with the planning people to talk about in-kind work. Hopefully this meeting will take place in February, also.

Chairman Averill stated we are looking at projects we are hoping would be part of the Basin-wide study in terms of match. He understands the lawyers are currently looking at this and there may be some answers in early January.

Mr. Goss stated the legislative language that formed the Flood Authority was used for the inter-local agreement. Can we use this based upon the time that the Flood Authority was signed and the work that has been done and submit it for in-kind work? He hopes to have an answer to that by early January. If we can go forward we still need to look at all the work that has been done and how the processes work and what portion of that dollar figure would be credited towards it.

Mr. Schillinger stated this project has been discussed for ten years. The funding is there but with the Corps constantly changing or re-evaluating the process is still five years away from implementing anything. He asked if there is any way to move that along.

Mr. Goss stated there may be some smaller dollar value projects that the Corps could look at under some other programs, rather than the General Investigation. As those come up the Corps could have the planning people take a look to determine rough dollar values and pull some of those out.

Mr. Donahue stated he has a list of staff people who attended the meeting about a year ago and he will send notification to those people. If there is anyone else who should be notified, please let him know.

g. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. Muller stated he has no new information since the last meeting when the Phase 2A geotechnical and scoping documents were distributed. When the Flood Authority authorizes Phase 2B the PUD will be ready to move forward.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Ripe and Ready Studies Report

Mr. Mackey discussed the upstream storage phase 2. A proposed scope and budget was presented to the Flood Authority. A resolution was requested and that will be discussed later in the agenda today.

Regarding the early warning system, West Consulting did hold six meetings and there will be a follow-up with questions from individuals and with early warning management people to finish putting their report together.

Mr. Mackey stated Mr. Batker, Earth Economics, should have a draft report next week.

8. Proposed ESA Adolfson Contract Amendment

Mr. Bob Johnson stated Lewis County is the lead agent to the Flood Authority with respect to contracts for funding through OFM. ESA Adolfson has been doing all the facilitation work that was previously contracted for. Some things that had not been contracted for, but they have been asked to do, need to be covered in a supplemental contract. There is a little money left in the original budget that was unallocated and ESA Adolfson prepared a scope of work for the additional necessary involvement in which they are participating. Before the Flood Authority is a resolution that will go to the Board of County Commissioners next Monday, asking for funds not to exceed \$80,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010.

Chairman Averill stated a resolution, the ESA Adolfson contract scope of work, and the compensation is included in the member packets. The total is \$79,255. He asked for questions or comments.

Mr. MacReynold stated his concern is \$80,000 and the consultant who wants to spend it. Is this value added service to what this Authority wants or is it just money we want to spend?

Chairman Averill stated there are some issues on different tracks. When the Flood Authority first made the agreement with ESA Adolfson for their current work with the Authority, the GI study was not in that statement of work. We have had to rely on ESA Adolfson to get that project together and do the scoping with the Corps. They have been doing part of that by using monies that were allocated to go to something else. We are trying to provide the money for this major change in the project scope of work for ESA Adolfson. Another issue is: originally when the open houses were conducted, the Flood Authority needed to participate and we relied on ESA Adolfson to put together all of the brochures and to man the tables at three open houses. This was not part of their contract and that issue was added into the scope of work to compensate them for work not initially included.

Mr. Schillinger stated Mr. MacReynold's question was a good one, but having been through all of that, Bruce and ESA Adolfson has already earned the money. Mr. Schillinger moved to adopt the Resolution and addendums.

Chairman Averill stated without objection, these documents would be adopted. There was no objection.

9. Memo from City of Chehalis

Chairman Averill stated Mr. Taylor had presented a memo from the City of Chehalis at the last meeting. It was essentially flood reduction project issues done cooperatively between the cities of Chehalis and Centralia to look at side issues to the Twin Cities project. The Chair asked Mr. MacReynold what the intentions are and to whom this memo should go.

Mr. MacReynold gave some background. On January 14, 2008, days after the 2007 flood, the cities of Chehalis and Centralia passed a joint resolution trying to figure out how the cities would recover, prior to the existence of the Authority, and that the two cities had to take some action to put people on notice that the only project being discussed at the time was the Corps project. Both jurisdictions voted against supporting that Corps project because of certain items that clearly helped in some places in the cities and harmed other locations. The City Councils took action to put the Corps on notice about the things that made the Councils vote against the Corps project that was on the table earlier. A few months ago Mr. MacReynold was informed that no one knew anything about these other things that the cities had been discussing and the best vehicle to bring this to the attention of the Corps was the Flood Authority. We felt it was important to share that resolution and to hopefully gain the support of this body and put the Corps on notice that they need to look at these and be able to respond to them if it wants support of our communities.

Mr. Goss stated when the Corps holds a meeting on the Twin Cities project on the 28th of January one thing the Corps wants to address is the tributaries: which ones the Twin Cities will cover, are we comfortable with the level, are there some that are not being addressed.

Mr. MacReynold stated the Cities are looking forward to that meeting and appreciate the Corps moving forward and looking at these items. At the same time, the Corps needs the Cities' support and requirement, at least if the Governor stands by her word that if our communities say "no" it is not proceeding. We want the Corps project to proceed but we also need to be able to say to the people who have been harmed before that we are doing everything we can.

Commissioner Willis understood after the discussion with the Colonel that the GI study was already done and in place and they were ready to move forward. Are you trying to bring these approved items into the GI study and were they there originally, and if you do it now, will you slow it down? The Colonel was very explicit that if we change the GI study at all he stops what he is doing.

Chairman Averill stated we are beyond the GI study. There is a Project Management Plan for the Twin Cities project. The original PMP was written in 2003 and he assumes there is a new PMP that the OFM has written with the Corps.

Commissioner Willis stated this is an authorized project and if these were not included the first time and we ask them to be included this time, does that "unauthorize" the project?

Mr. MacReynold stated he cannot answer that. These items were not included in the original 65% that prompted the City of Centralia and the City of Chehalis to vote against support. If the Corps has not made any adjustment on its current plan, then our cities could vote against it. They cannot support any project that may stop the freeway from flooding and flood residents in our communities.

Chairman Averill stated in the original 2003 PMP many of the issues that are here were outside the scope of the project based on the cost benefit ratio that the Corps used at that time. One reason Chairman Averill was an advocate of the basin-wide plan is there were holes in the project and it did nothing for the upper basin and very little for the lower basin; therefore a basin-wide solution was needed to look at other alternatives. We are taking 2007 and 2009 data and putting them in the 35% design. When we meet on the 28th we need to speak to some of these issues to determine what holes still exist. That does not necessarily mean that if we continue to have a hole that we won't work on it in the new GI study. The memo is good in that it identifies the reservations that the two cities have as we look at this project and have to be addressed.

Commissioner Willis wanted to understand if these were in the original project or do we need to move them forward. Now you have alluded that they can be moved to another GI. We need the process clarified.

Mr. White thought these should be on the list of projects that was drafted a year or so ago. Every jurisdiction has these types of issues; we have 200 projects and we can't push five or six.

Mr. Sorensen stated we should know on January 28 whether or not this is an issue based on what Mr. MacReynold discussed. Does it slow down what is going on or can it be worked in or addressed? Some of the creeks have been talked about.

Chairman Averill stated the secondary access to the hospital will be resolved predominately by the new Mellen Street exchange. He asked the desire of the Flood Authority: do we want to note this for the record or should this be forwarded to someone?

Mr. MacReynold stated on the second page of the report the City of Chehalis is requesting support from the Authority the inclusion of the projects listed as part of the Twin Cities project. He made a motion that the Flood Authority would support consideration of these issues as part of the project. Mr. Sorensen seconded.

Commissioner Willis is concerned that the Flood Authority is insisting that these be included as part of the Twin Cities Project. This is already an authorized project and we are stating these items need to be included. Commissioner Willis is not sure they are in the project at this time and she does not want to take the burden of stopping the Twin Cities project because of something she is unaware of. She needs more information. It is not that she does not support these projects; they are most likely within the scope of things that need to be done, but she goes back to the conversation with the Colonel. Can we back this up and if so, how far?

Chairman Averill stated there is a "magical" 20% and we don't know what that is.

Mr. MacReynold stated the Corps was aware of that resolution in January of 2008. This is nothing new but the information he has is that there is need of formal support to ensure that at least these things are

considered. If we don't do that then we have not provided due diligence for our residents. The City of Chehalis does not wish to slow down the project but the Corps needs to be able to articulate either how it has incorporated these things or why they have not and therefore how they will be mitigated.

Mr. Sorensen agreed with Mr. MacReynold. It is not Centralia's intent to slow the project. He hopes the 28th will be the opportunity to address these issues.

Commissioner Willis suggested changing the last paragraph on the resolution to state "the City of Chehalis is requesting support from the Authority for consideration of the projects listed" as opposed to "for inclusion of the projects".

Chairman Averill asked if this could be considered a friendly amendment and Mr. MacReynold stated yes. Many of these are already included in the project, though not all.

Mr. White suggested tabling this until after the 28th if these questions will be answered at that time. The City of Chehalis could amend the resolution depending on the answers they receive.

Commissioner Valenzuela seconded to table the motion.

Mr. Schillinger spoke to both issues. Centralia and Chehalis need to consider this: those of us from down at the lower end drive up I-5 and see you continuing to fill in the flood plains as if that had no impact or affect. We are very empathetic to the people who flood but you can't create additional problems and then expect to be bailed out. Where are we regarding that issue?

Mr. MacReynold stated the City of Chehalis complies with all state and federal regulations with reference to fill. All development has to meet those standards.

Mr. White asked if filling in the flood plain is appropriate as long as long as all state and federal regulations are met.

Mr. MacReynold stated as long as those regulations are met, yes.

Commissioner Valenzuela called for the question.

Chairman Averill stated there were two nays and the Authority is under the constriction of consent unless no agreement can be reached. Either the nay votes must be swayed or there needs to be a 60% consent.

Mr. Cook stated he believes the Authority has more things in common and more positive things going for it than the negatives. He agrees that every item on the list is important for the communities, as well as the items on the lists of the other jurisdictions. It is agreed that additional information is needed to make an informed decision and based on that tabling the motion until the January 28 meeting is the best course of action.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated that the rules of procedure need to be reviewed. It is not consistent to say that we operate by consensus and then permit the making of and voting on motions. This motion was passed by a majority of voters.

Chairman Averill stated the rules of procedure are the rules and each member has a copy of them. They are the same rules of procedure used in the Chehalis Basin Partnership. The requirement is to try to come to consensus. If we cannot come to consensus, then we need 60% majority.

Mr. MacReynold asked the Chair to repeat the tabling motion.

Chairman Averill stated as he understands it, this motion is to be tabled until after the meeting with the Corps on January 28 to see what issues will be addressed in the Twin Cities Project. The motion will be taken up again at the next meeting of the Flood Authority in February.

Mr. MacReynold stated for the sake of maintaining a good working relationship with the Authority he recommended supporting the table motion. Mr. Sorensen agreed.

Chairman Averill stated now there was consensus and the motion was tabled until the February meeting.

10. Coordinated Study

Mr. Mackey stated the member packets include a memo from ESA Adolfson regarding the potential coordinated study. Going back to the joint meetings with Chehalis and Centralia and the comments received at the open house, how do you consider both of these projects at the same time and is there a way to analyze that. Is there a way to look at consistent information between the two projects, the upstream storage and the Twin Cities Project, and is there a way to do that in a timely manner rather than waiting for the work to be done in the basin-wide GI. The concerns expressed at the council meetings and the governor's office did not fall on deaf ears. In fact, the governor's office proposed an independent study to determine if the two studies could use common data and perhaps look at a combination of the two. A group of people from the Authority, Congressman Baird's office and agencies thought it might be timely and less expensive by using the people who are currently involved to make this work. The PUD's proposed phase 2 already states they are willing to do their work in compliance with the Corps standards.

The purpose of a coordinated study would be to develop comparable data on the benefits costs and impacts of both the Twin Cities and the project and various combinations of those. That would take some additional work that would augment the PUD work currently being considered.

Your facilitator has tried to get those discussions mature enough to bring to you with a question. If you agree with that effort, simply authorize ESA Adolfson to work with those various people to see if we can bring that type of proposal forward. This is an exploratory effort to determine if that is a direction the Flood Authority would like to take. If it is ESA Adolfson will pursue it.

Mr. White understands the letter to say that the Flood Authority has decided the levees or dam are the only solutions, or various combinations of those two projects. We haven't looked at any other alternative.

Mr. Mackey argued that the reason for the basin-wide GI is to look at a basin-wide solution. This addresses one critical question, which is: is there a way to look at these two in a comparable and timely way. That does not preclude doing anything else.

Mr. White asked if the Corps didn't already look at dams or this combination.

Mr. Goss' comment was yes.

Chairman Averill stated when that question was asked in 1982 it was in response to the Twin Cities Project which was to provide protection to Centralia and Chehalis and the transportation corridor going through it was not a basin-wide look.

Mr. Goss' comment was that is true.

Chairman Averill stated that referring back to the answer given he suggested it is apples and oranges; it is a different question. The other aspect is to consider the potential water retention project based on putting power generation into it. There are some other possibilities that involve water retention. One that might require the least work is water retention capability. What kind of dam would we need for that, how big would it be, and what would the costs and benefits be. Is there a benefit to improving the quality of the water in the river and if we did a project just for water retention and water quality improvement what would that look like. Another possibility is the full-scale project, which has been contracted for with EES. This is also saying we need to look at options other than a big project that includes all three of those.

Mr. Mackey stated this is intended to address the issue which is why aren't these two projects being looked at? There is not enough time to look at them if you wait for the GI. We are not trying to preclude a basin-wide solution or that it would not be complementary to something else. What is proposed by the governor's office and discussed by this group is if this is something you want to look at and do in a timely manner. We don't have a lot of the detail because you have not stated if this is the direction you want to go.

Mr. MacReynold asked if this proposal impacts the timeline for either project.

Mr. Mackey stated it does not for the Corps project. That is going along its designated schedule. At this stage the PUD project is going forward. The Phase 2B has been proposed and that will be considered at the January meeting. Depending on the answers you get from the Corps regarding what counts as match and if it does not count as match do you want to delay. If there is some augmented work that could answer the question of a coordinated study there may be some minor things in the PUD project that they could change in either scale or timing. Mr. Mackey is not proposing any of that at this time. He is assuming the two are going ahead but this is one way to compare the two and answer some of the questions that you are being asked.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated this information might have been more appropriate to bring to a work session rather than trying to work it out during the Authority meeting.

Mr. Mackey stated that is exactly what he wanted. He is saying this is an idea and if you like it ESA will spend time working on it and bring it to the next work session.

Ms. Lee stated she would like to look at all possibilities before making a final decision.

Chairman Averill stated with no objection the Authority would move forward to looking at this project and bringing it to a work session. There was no objection.

11. Upstream Storage Analysis Phase 2B

Mr. Mackey stated the resolution in the packet, pages 1 and 2, state the way this has been done in the past is to ask the PUD to present a scope and budget to the sub-committee and they in turn will make recommendations to the Flood Authority. The third part could be postponed because of what the timing is and if you want to have this work proceed and not know whether or not it counts as match. Hopefully there will be more information on that in January.

Mr. Thompson noted the agenda states the Flood Authority will review the draft resolution to approve the Phase 2B of the upstream storage analysis. He asked if Mr. Mackey is recommending waiting for another month and go through another work session before action is taken.

Mr. Mackey thought the sub-committee could start the work and put the interlocal agreement together. He suggests waiting until the Flood Authority knows what the options are in terms of this counting as match until January.

Mr. Thompson agreed.

Chairman Averill spoke on behalf of Lewis County, stating Lewis County would be concerned if this was put off past January because the study is in hand and the continuation of the work in 2B is important. We have a sub-committee that has made a recommendation to us on how to proceed. He appreciates and supports that if we can make this work part of the basin-wide study and get credit for it that it is to our advantage; however he would not want to put this off until February or March to make that decision.

A motion was made by Ms. Lee to table the recommendation until the January meeting; seconded by Mr. MacReynold. There was no objection and the motion was approved.

NEW BUSINESS

12. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson summarized the report. There is a balance of unencumbered funds of \$135,347. That would change with the authorization for ESA Adolphson to continue with the additional scope of work. With that in mind, the balance remaining of expended funds is \$1.4 million. The encumbered funds are funds that were encumbered for studies including some of the work that is in progress. We still have a balance and can make it through to June 31. Other goods and services is the category where staff other than Lewis County staff charges for time they spend, particularly Thurston County and Grays Harbor County. There is no money left in that fund. There is money in the overall budget but Mr. Johnson has been informed by OFM that we need to do an amendment to the supplemental agreement that we already have with them to shift some money from category to category. Looking at the salary and wages and employee benefits that were originally authorized for Lewis County it is not going down at that rapid a pace. There is still a little over \$22,000 left in those two line items. With the Authority's permission, Mr. Johnson will draft a second supplement to the interlocal agreement with OFM and switch some of the monies around so there is enough money to pay for the staff support for the BAC. Lewis County will not need all the money allocated for its staff. Although the original case manager

stated there were no concerns as long as we didn't spend more than \$2.5 million the current OFM manager is concerned that we don't overspend each line item.

With the Authority's permission, Mr. Johnson will submit a supplemental agreement at the next meeting.

Chairman Averill asked that Mr. Johnson add to that the negative flow in the consulting services issue.

Mr. Johnson stated we have the capacity to do that and it will be done.

Mr. White stated at the last meeting Chehalis requested a copy of what the Lewis County Prosecutor's Office work is and what is paid to them. He has not seen that information yet.

Chairman Averill stated a more detailed expenditure description was requested and it can be sent to the members.

Chairman Averill asked if there was any objection for Mr. Johnson to submit a supplemental agreement to OFM. There was no objection.

13. Officer Elections

Chairman Averill stated elections could be held at this meeting or in January.

Mr. White suggested waiting until January since Commissioner Willis was no longer present at this meeting.

Chairman Averill stated elections would be on the January agenda.

14. Confirm Next Meeting and Board Requested Topics

The next meeting of the Flood Authority will be Thursday, January 21 at 1:30 p.m. There will be a morning work session beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the WSU Extension Conference room in the basement of the courthouse. The Chair made note of the meeting dates and times for 2010 shown on the agenda for the members' reference.

15. Adjourn

There was no other business to come before the Flood Authority and the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.